

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 16, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-26 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 7, 16, 21, and 22 have been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 16 recites statutory subject matter in a computer-readable medium containing a program for providing a user with access to parameterized quires. The Examiner asserts, "The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101." However, a computer-readable medium which contains a functional program is a statutory computer element. As stated in MPEP 2106.01.I,

[A] claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See *Lowry*, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

The computer program of independent claim 16 is resident on a computer readable storage medium and defines interrelationships which permit the functionality of

providing a user with access to parameterized queries. Parameterized queries permit the user to drill down into objects contained in the results set. Access to such parameterized queries is useful, in that users may not be aware that a parameterized query associated with a specific type of data object even exists. The functionality of the computer program contained in the computer-readable medium of claim 16 produces a useful result, therefore independent claim 16 and each of its dependent claims recite statutory subject matter.

Similarly, amended independent claim 22 recites statutory subject matter in a computer-readable medium containing a data processing system, wherein the executable component of the data processing system is configured to provide an indication of the identified parameterized queries to a user. The functionality of the data processing system contained in the computer-readable medium of claim 22 produces a useful result, therefore independent claim 22 and each of its dependent claims recite statutory subject matter.

Since independent claims 16 and 22, and their dependent claims, recite statutory subject matter, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yuknewicz et al* (hereinafter "*Yuknewicz*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. For example, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identify one or more parameterized queries associated with fields in a result set, as disclosed in the parallel language of independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 22.

With reference to claim 1, the Examiner argues that *Yuknewicz* discloses an executable component configured to identify one or more parameterized queries only if each field, specified as required in one or more parameterized query associations corresponding to the identified parameterized queries, are contained in the result set at paragraph [0056]. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to loading a user-selected parameterized query. *Yuknewicz* further describes how loading the user-selected parameterized query causes the form to be populated with a selected portion of the dataset. Thus, the selected portion of the dataset is identified by the user-selected parameterized query, and not the other way around. In other words, the parameterized query of *Yuknewicz* is user-selected; the parameterized query is not identified on the basis of fields in a result set and predefined associations specifying one or more fields involved in conditions with parameter markers that are contained in a corresponding parameterized query. Thus, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries based on fields in a result set.

With reference to claims 7 and 16, the Examiner argues that *Yuknewicz* discloses identifying one or more parameterized queries, each associated with one or more of the plurality of fields in the results set at paragraph [0049]. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to populating a drop down menu of existing parameterized queries by searching a schema metadata file. The contents of the schema metadata file is not based upon a result set, therefore the search of the schema metadata file could not identify parameterized queries associated with fields in the result set. The population of a drop down menu in *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries based on fields in a result set.

With reference to claim 12, the Examiner argues that *Yuknewicz* discloses analyzing a results set presented to identify parameterized queries associated with fields contained therein at paragraph [0048]. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to a menu which enables the user to select the dataset in which the parameterized query is to be executed. The fields of the user-selected dataset are not analyzed. Therefore, *Yuknewicz* could not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries based on fields in a result set.

With reference to claim 22, Examiner argues that *Yuknewicz* discloses an executable component configured to examine a results set obtained in response to issuing a first query, examine the set of parameterized query associations to identify parameterized queries associated with fields in the results set, and provide an indication of the identified parameterized queries to a user at paragraphs [0074]-[0075]. However, the cited passages are in fact directed to executing the parameterized query and displaying the query results. While query results are identified and displayed to the user, an indication of identified parameterized queries is not. *Yuknewicz* simply does not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries based on fields in a result set.

Yuknewicz does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. In particular, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identify one or more parameterized queries associated with fields in a result set. Thus, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 22, are not anticipated.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 22, and their dependents, are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)